STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
LANSING

JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

MICHAEL P. FLANAGAN
SUPERINTENDENT OF
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

January 25, 2010

MEMORANDUM

TO: State Board of Education

FROM: Michael P. Flanagan, Chairman

SUBJECT: Approval of Additional Accountability Workbook Amendment for 2009-10

The State Board of Education approved amendments to the State's Accountability Workbook in December 2009 to ensure that the Peer Review of the graduation rate calculations would be submitted by the January 15, 2010 deadline. Chief State School Officers were notified that they could submit additional amendments, if needed, by February 15, 2010 for use in the accountability system for the 2010-11 school year. The amendment, described below, would allow a closer alignment between recent education reform legislation and state and federal accountability.

The current measure of adequate yearly progress (AYP) for a school requires the school to meet the annual proficiency objective or to show sufficient improvement toward the proficiency objective (as implemented in the 'Safe Harbor' provision). Michigan identifies a school for improvement if it fails to make AYP for two consecutive years, fails to meet the additional indicator (graduation rate or attendance rate), or fails to assess at least 95% of enrolled students. Michigan requests an amendment to its Accountability Workbook to include a new indicator. If a school is identified among the 5% persistently lowest performing schools in the state, that school will not make AYP.

Rationale:

During grant application work for the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund II, the Race to the Top, and the Title I School Improvement grants, the state was required to develop a list of the lowest achieving schools using specific criteria. To identify the lowest-achieving schools, the state had to take into account both academic achievement of the "all students" group in a school in terms of proficiency on the statewide assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and the school's lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

KATHLEEN N. STRAUS – PRESIDENT • JOHN C. AUSTIN – VICE PRESIDENT
CAROLYN L. CURTIN – SECRETARY • MARIANNE YARED MCGUIRE – TREASURER
NANCY DANHOF – NASBE DELEGATE • ELIZABETH W. BAUER
REGINALD M. TURNER • CASANDRA E. ULBRICH

608 WEST ALLEGAN STREET • P.O. BOX 30008 • LANSING, MICHIGAN 48909
www.michigan.gov/mde • (517) 373-3324

“all students” group. When the list was drafted, many schools on the list appear to be making AYP often enough to not be identified for improvement. Unless a school is identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring, additional funds cannot be provided for intensive support and turnaround.

Michigan would like to ensure that all available support can be provided to the persistently lowest-achieving schools especially at this time when additional funds are available through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

It is recommended that the State Board of Education approve the additional Accountability Workbook Amendment for 2009-10 as described in the Superintendent’s memorandum dated January 25, 2010.

ATTACHMENT

3.1 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?

The current measure of adequate yearly progress (AYP) for a school requires the school to meet the annual proficiency objective or to show sufficient improvement toward the proficiency objective (as implemented in the 'Safe Harbor' provision). Michigan identifies a school for improvement if it fails to make AYP for two consecutive years, or fails to meet the additional indicator (graduation rate or attendance rate), or fails to assess at least 95% of enrolled students. Michigan requests an amendment to the Accountability Workbook to include a new indicator. If a school is identified among the 5% persistently lowest performing schools in the state, that school will not make AYP.

Rationale:

During grant application work for the State Fiscal Stabilization Fund II, the Race to the Top, and the Title I School Improvement grants, the state was required to develop a list of the lowest performing schools using specific criteria. To identify the lowest-achieving schools, the state had to take into account both academic achievement of the “all students” group in a school in terms of proficiency on the statewide assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics combined; and the school’s lack of progress on those assessments over a number of years in the “all students” group. When the list was drafted, many schools on the list appear to be making AYP often enough to not be identified for improvement. Unless a school is identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring, additional funds cannot be provided for intensive support and turnaround.

Michigan would like to ensure that all available support can be provided to the persistently lowest-achieving schools especially at this time when additional funds are available through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.